

the floor so the House can give it the bipartisan vote it deserves.

HOCKEY FIGHTS CANCER DAY ON THE HILL

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of National Hockey League's Hockey Fights Cancer Day on the Hill.

Anyone who has played the great sport of hockey or who has watched a game has probably seen a fight or two on the ice. It's no secret that hockey players are a tough group. But off the ice, there are bigger fights being waged each and every day by people even tougher than your average hockey player, even players like former Blackhawk Reid Simpson.

Those living with and fighting against cancer are tougher than the toughest odds and incredibly brave in spite of daunting treatment and an uncertain future. With nearly 12 million patients in America today, most of us know someone fighting cancer, be it a family member, friend, or neighbor.

The NHL's Hockey Fights Cancer initiative is an extraordinary opportunity for members of the hockey family to stand up for our loved ones and to support the organizations that provide cutting-edge research, therapy, and vital support services that make their lives better.

This is one fight I'm proud to be a part of, and I encourage other hockey fans out there to join me as Hockey Fights Cancer.

CURRENCY REFORM FOR FAIR TRADE ACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of American families whose jobs and livelihoods are being undermined by China and other countries which purposely undervalue their currency.

For the past several years, the best economic research has shown that China manipulates the value of its currency by at least 25 to 30 percent against the dollar.

This blatantly unfair trading practice has contributed to our trade deficit with China, growing it from \$68 billion to \$273 billion in just 11 years. Worst of all, the American people have become the ultimate victims. Last month, the Economic Policy Institute found that 2.8 million U.S. jobs have been eliminated or displaced since 2001 due to the growing U.S.-China trade deficit.

Last year, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act passed this Chamber with strong bipartisan support. Yesterday, unfortunately, the new House majority voted nearly identical legisla-

tion down. The Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act has been supported by Members on both sides of the aisle and would give this and any administration the authority to take countervailing measures against currency manipulators, like China, in support of hard-working Americans.

We need to change that, Madam Speaker.

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, the best way to reduce the debt that this country has is to put people back to work. When they are back to work, they are paying their taxes and they are not getting unemployment. We need to get everybody in this country working, and the President proposed a bill called the American Jobs Act that does just that. It focuses on innovation, American innovation and ingenuity. It focuses on education and our community colleges and our K-12, and it focuses on rebuilding this country's infrastructure: our roads, our bridges, and our energy system.

But you know what happened over in the Senate yesterday; every single Republican voted against this. That bill has Republican ideas and Democratic ideas, but every single Republican voted against it.

We need to put the people in this country back to work. We don't need to be playing politics about the White House 13 months out from the election. That American Jobs Act needs to be passed, and it needs to be passed right now.

VOTER SUPPRESSION

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, this year a number of States are taking steps to make it more difficult for citizens to register to vote, to limit early voting, and to require photo IDs at the polls. The proponents of these new laws argue that they are designed to combat voter fraud. Clearly, we don't want people voting illegally, but these new laws are a solution to a problem that does not exist, and these steps will create serious problems.

A recent report by the Brennan Center at NYU shows that these new laws would affect more than 5 million eligible voters and would disproportionately disenfranchise young, low-income, and minority citizens.

In the past, literacy tests and poll taxes were used selectively to allow certain citizens to vote and disenfranchise others. They were and are illegal, and they should remain so. So we must oppose 21st century poll taxes which seek to suppress the vote of eligible voters and deny them their constitu-

tional rights and weaken our democracy.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, there is a strange thing that is going to be happening on this floor in just a little while. We should be focusing like a laser on jobs and strengthening the middle class. But instead, the majority is bringing forth a measure, the Protect Life Act. It's a measure coming before this body which, quite honestly, Members have had a chance to express themselves on numerous times. This does not create jobs. And what's ironic about it is this Protect Life Act is actually putting the lives of women at risk.

I really don't think that the American people feel that right now, today, that this is the highest priority for our country. Our highest priority is finding jobs for people in our country, not taking away lifesaving care from women.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to H.R. 358. When I speak with women in my district, they are concerned about finding a job, keeping their home from foreclosure, or putting food on the table. What they do not ask for is their constitutional rights to be threatened or their health to be endangered. Yet this bill does just that.

Rather than focus on continuing to rebuild our Nation's economy, the Republican majority is focusing their time on, once again, seeking to limit women's access to reproductive care.

I am particularly troubled that this bill, the Protect Life Act, actually does just the opposite. This bill would override core patient protections and allow hospitals to legally refuse lifesaving treatment to women, thus allowing them to die in a hospital despite their treatable condition. This extreme legislation is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the jobs crisis facing American families.

I urge my colleagues, if they truly want to protect life, to vote against this bill.

□ 1200

SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID: KEEPING FAITH WITH AMERICA'S SENIORS, THE DISABLED, AND THE NEEDY

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to issue a warning to America's seniors and working families: Top Republicans are still trying to privatize Social Security. The GOP Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN, author of the budget that ends Medicare and increased health costs for seniors, admitted he views Social Security as a Ponzi scheme. And Congressman PETE SESSIONS, who serves in House leadership for the GOP, introduced legislation labeled "Savings Account For Every American Act" that would have people opt out of Social Security by sending their contributions to a private account.

According to Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, this change will "severely compromise" the ability to pay for current seniors and those near retirement. "So Social Security, the ability to pay benefits to people who are currently receiving, or are now approaching the time of receiving benefits, would be severely compromised. Our year of trust fund exhaustion would certainly come to be much sooner than 2036." In other words, the plan of the Republicans to privatize Social Security would put that program that has never missed a check to Americans in danger. We need to oppose those efforts.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 358, PROTECT LIFE ACT

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted and that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order that the rule, H. Res. 430, violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution vio-

lates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I raise this point of order that H.R. 358 contains several potential unfunded mandates that would burden the States, burden private insurance companies, and burden women. I am also raising this point of order because it is a powerful vehicle to register my concern that this bill is a misguided ideological distraction from what should be our top priority—getting people back to work and protecting working families who have been hit hard by economic circumstances.

It is so clear to me that in spite of what our colleagues may say across the aisle, this bill is not about public funding for abortion. It's really crystal clear, Madam Speaker, that the Affordable Care Act already explicitly prohibits Federal funding for abortion. It reaffirms the Hyde amendment. It even includes the Nelson amendment to ensure that there's no commingling of funds. H.R. 358 would bring back the infamous world of Stupak-Pitts. But this time it adds even more restrictive language to the proposal.

This bill would essentially ban insurance coverage of abortion in health care exchanges, not just for women who are being publicly funded or subsidized in the exchanges, but even for women paying with their own private dollars, Madam Speaker. In addition, H.R. 358 would create a system that plays Russian roulette with pregnant women's lives when they enter a hospital. This would mean that any hospital could refuse to perform an emergency abortion—even if a woman would die without it—without violating the Federal law designed to prevent people from being denied emergency medical care.

It goes even further by paving the way to allow State refusal laws that are not limited to the provision of abortion services, but to anything that would be considered controversial—treatment for STIs, birth control services, screening services, and counseling.

With that, I would yield time to my good colleague from California, Representative SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, I think this bill goes to the farthest extreme in trying to take women down not just a peg but take them in shackles to some cave somewhere. Twenty-five years ago, this body passed EMTALA, a bill that basi-

cally said anyone that shows up at an emergency room would access health care, no questions asked. Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to amend that law and basically say, Oh, except for a woman who is in need of an abortion, or except for a woman who's bleeding to death who happens to be pregnant, or except for a woman who is miscarrying.

Basically, what this bill would do is say that any hospital could decline to provide services to one class of people in this country. And that one class of people is pregnant women.

Let me tell you something. My story is pretty well known now. I was pregnant. I was miscarrying. I was bleeding. If I had to go from one hospital to the next trying to find one emergency room that would take me in, who knows if I would even be here today.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do is misogynist. It is absolutely misogynist.

The time has come for us to stop taking up this issue over and over again this year and do something that the American people really care about. They want jobs. They want to be able to hold on to their homes. They want some mortgage relief. And what do we do? We stand here on the floor and create yet another opportunity for women to be cast in shackles.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you for that compelling story.

How much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman, for yielding to me. I rise in support of her point of order.

The American people are begging us to work together to create jobs to bolster the economy. Instead, we're here once again to consider legislation that endangers and attacks the right of women and is far out of the mainstream of American priorities.

H.R. 358 is extreme legislation. It is another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health. It would take away a woman's right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health—even with her own money. It would allow public hospitals, as you heard, to deny emergency abortion care to women in life-threatening situations. It would expand the existing conscience objection to allow providers to avoid providing contraception. We're talking now about birth control.

This legislation revives a debate that has already been settled. There is no Federal funding for an abortion in the health care reform law. Legal experts have said it, independent fact-check organizations have said it. Yet Republicans continue to insist that the possibility of funding remains.